

V. REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishibashi (US 5,695,188) in view of DeMar et al. (US 6,315,660). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to overcome the rejection, the Applicant amends claims 1 and 4, as indicated above, to clarify the difference between the prior art reference by adjusting the scope of the claims to a new and useful game machine. The game machine according to the present invention now includes the features of:

- (i) the variable display, stop buttons, and the lower display device positioned below the stop buttons are all attached to the front door body; and
- (ii) the lower display device displays images on the basis of image data stored in the image ROM.

Ishibashi discloses the conventional type of slots machine that is corresponding to the RELATED ART in the specification of the incident application. Namely, the display panels that usually use a physical acrylic plate and a symbol cell sheet of unsold machines of Ishibashi may not be utilized for another kind of machine because of the drawn symbols unlike other parts such as cabinets and front door bodies. Additionally, during the assembly of the machine, the step of attaching a display panel unit to a front door is so necessary that the number of manufacturing steps would not be decreased.

DeMar shows a lower display for the purpose of providing an additional display for conveying game state information. The additional display however fixed to a totally different part of body (not on the front door body) with the game machine so the construction is different to the present invention that both of the upper display device and the lower display device together with one or more stop buttons are all attached to the front door body of the game machine.

As a matter of fact, the upper and the lower displays of DeMar are the dedicated displays since the game (e.g. MONOPOLY) can be performed by the combination of both displays. Even in the case of DeMar, the conventional acrylic plates and/or a

symbol cell sheet need to be replaced if the dead stock game machine is used for other game purpose. So there is no solution for the problem that the present invention has solved even if Ishibashi reference is combined with the disclosure of DeMar. There is no teaching, suggestion or motivation in the prior art references to utilize the same hardware structure for different types of game machines with less changes.

In the game machine utilizing the present invention, the variable display, stop buttons, and the lower display device positioned below the stop buttons are all attached to the front door body, and the lower display device displays images on the basis of image data stored in the image ROM.

According to the above-described construction, it is possible to reduce disadvantages such as dead stock and increased assembly steps which occur when a physical acrylic plate and a symbol cell sheet are used.

It is respectfully submitted that that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of the claims 1 and 4 as amended and discussed above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art could not combine the features of the applied art to arrive at the claimed invention because the applied art is devoid of all the features of the claimed invention. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 4 are allowable over the applied art.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Claims 5-9 depend from claim 4 and includes all of the features of claim 4. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 4 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this Amendment is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Further, Applicant asserts that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are

patentable. Applicant hereby reserves the right to set forth further arguments and remarks supporting the patentability of their claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Date: November 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal
 Petition for Extension of Time (three months)

DC297176.DOC